



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,179	06/07/2001	Etsuo Ogino	WATA:012	5855

7590 06/03/2003  
ROSSI & ASSOCIATES  
P.O. Box 826  
Ashburn, VA 20146-0826

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2813

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/876,179

Applicant(s)

OGINO ET AL.

Examiner

Thanh T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2813

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 5/27/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouderkirk et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,842) in view of Kamiya (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,179).

Ouderkirk et al. teaches a substrate for a reflection type liquid crystal display element comprising:

A transparent substrate, and a reflective mirror formed on top of the transparent substrate, wherein the reflective mirror (see figure 2b) comprises a predetermined number of high refractive index first transparent film composed of a first dielectric material (noted that, polymer films is made of dielectric material, see col. 4, lines 20-23) and low-refractive-index second transparent films composed of a second dielectric material (noted that, polymer films is made of dielectric material, see col. 4, lines 20-23) laminated alternately on the transparent substrate (see

Art Unit: 2813

col. 4, lines 64-67), and wherein either or both of the first transparent films and the second transparent films are arranged such that a thickness thereof increases progressively or decreases progressively with distance from the transparent substrate (see col. 11, lines 1-14, as claimed in claim 2) to suppress occurrence of ripples in an optical spectrum or optical transmission spectrum across a visible region (see col. 4, lines 20-23).

Regarding to claim 2, a substrate for a reflection type liquid crystal display element, wherein the first transparent films are arranged such that a film thickness thereof increases progressively or decreases progressively with distance from the transparent substrate (see col. 11, lines 1-14)

Regarding to claims 3-4, a substrate for a reflection type liquid crystal display element, wherein the predetermined number is in a range of 3 to 14. (see figures 2a-2b, col. 4, lines 1-15)

Regarding to claim 5, a substrate for a reflection type liquid crystal display element (see figure 2b, col. 5, lines 5-33)

However, Ouderkirk et al. does not teach the first refractive film  $\text{TiO}_2$  which has the refractive index of at least 1.8 at a wavelength of 550nm the second refractive film  $\text{SiO}_2$  which has the refractive index of less than 1.5 at the wavelength of 550nm (as claimed in claims 6-10).

Kamiya teaches a method of forming a transparent substrate (1) and a reflective mirror (10/20/30) on top of the transparent substrate, wherein the reflective mirror (10/20/30) comprises a high refractive index first transparent film ( $\text{TiO}_2$ ) and low refractive index second transparent films ( $\text{SiO}_2$ ).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the requisite art at the time of the invention was made would form the first refractive film  $\text{TiO}_2$  which has the

Art Unit: 2813

refractive index of at least 1.8 at a wavelength of 550nm the second refractive film  $\text{SiO}_2$  which has the refractive index of less than 1.5 at the wavelength of 550nm in process or Ouderkirk et al. as taught by Kamiya because the process would provide highly accurate images and it is also known in the LCD processing art that determining the optimum material for the layer only involved routine skill in the art.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 5/27/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contended that Ouderkirk does not teach a suggest first transparent film composed of a first dielectric material second transparent films composed of a second dielectric material (noted that, polymer films is made of dielectric material, see col. 4, lines 20-23) and wherein either or both of the first transparent films and the second transparent films are arrange such that a thickness thereof increases progressively or decreases progressively with distance from the transparent substrate to suppress occurrence of ripples in an optical spectrum or optical transmission spectrum across a visible region. In response to applicant that Ouderkirk does teach first transparent film composed of a first dielectric material (noted that, polymer films is made of dielectric material, see col. 4, lines 20-23) and second transparent films composed of a second dielectric material (noted that, polymer films is made of dielectric material, see col. 4, lines 20-23), and wherein either or both of the first transparent films and the second transparent films are arrange such that a thickness thereof increases progressively or decreases progressively with distance from the transparent substrate (see col. 11, lines 1-14, as claimed in claim 2) to suppress

Art Unit: 2813

occurrence of ripples in an optical spectrum or optical transmission spectrum across a visible region (see col. 4, lines 20-23).

Applicant contended that Ouderkirk does not teach a suggest a reflective mirror. In response to applicant that Ouderkirk does teach a reflective mirror (see col. 5, line 6-7).

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-9439, or by Email via address Thanh.Nguyen@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30AM to 4:0PM.

Art Unit: 2813

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, can be reached on (703) 308-4940. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956 (See **MPEP 203.08**).

Thanh Nguyen

  
CARL WHITEHEAD, JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800